Vol. XVI.
No. 4.

APRIL 1920.

Who
No. 1

ॐ

The Jaina Gazette

Thou, Thou, the Ideal Man,
Fair, able, beautiful, content, and loving,
Complete in body and dilate in spirit,
Be thou my God.

—*Walt Whitman.*

Consciousness.

God, what a glory, is this consciousness,
Of life on life, that comes to those who seek!
Nor would I, if I might, to others speak,
The fulness of that knowledge. It can bless,
Only the eager souls, that willing, press
Along the mountain passes, to the peak.

Not to the dull, the doubting, or the weak,
Will Truth explain, or Mystery confess.
Not to the curious or impatient soul
That in the start, demands the end be shown,
And at each step, stops waiting for a sign;
But to the tireless toiler toward the goal,
Shall the great miracles of God be known
And life revealed, immortal and divine.

E. W. Wilcox.

The Birth Day of Lord Mahavira,

THE month of Chaitra is very sacred to all the Jainas: because it was on the 9th day of the dark half of the month that Lord Rishaba Deva, the First Teacher of Mankind was born and Lord Mahavira the Last Thirthankara and the Great Expenent of

the Scripture came into the world on the 13th day of the same half of the same month. Of these two holy days the Birth Day of Lord Mahavira is more important; because it is of comparatively recent occurrence, and it is the birth day of the Jina after whom this period is named (i.e.) Vardhamana Kala. For the interval time between one Thirthankara and the next, is often called after the name of the foregoing Arhat. And so the long duration of time from the Nirvana of Lord Mahavira till the Birth of the next Jina will be called the Age of Mahavira. Moreover it is Lord Mahavira that preached the Scripture in a systematic form and gave to the world His Teachings in the form we have. And so His Birth Day is very holy and should be remembered and celebrated in the most befitting manner.

Several Kavyas and Puranas describe in flowery language the festivities of Lord Mahavira's birth. Six months before the Soul of the Arhat entered the womb of His mother the Angels (Devas) cleaned and decorated the City of Kundalapura and announced to King Siddhartha and his Queen Priyakarini about the incarnation of the Last Thirthankara. They were extremely happy; and as days passed on, the queen dreamt one morning 16 dreams which indicated that the Soul of the Thirthankara entered her womb. At the end of an undisturbed period of pregnancy, the queen was delivered on the thirteenth day of the dark half of the month of Chaitra about 75 years before the end of *Dhushama Sushama* period of the *Avasarpini* era. All nature rejoiced at the event. All the *diks* regions and the wide Akasa became clear and pure; all the people felt great joy; in the Svargalokas the Kalpaka vrikshas showered flowers; trumpets sounded in the celestial regions; cool fragrant breeze was blowing; every side of the earth shook; the ocean roared with great noise; at that moment the seat of Saudharmendra shook a little; the bells rang in the heavens; lion-roar was heard in the shining spheres; drums were beaten in the Vyantara regions; in the Bhavana loka they blew conches.

By these strange phenomena and by the shaking of their several seats the four kinds of Angels, the Kalpavasis, the Jyotishkas, the Vyantaras and the Bhavanavasis, came to know of the birth of the Thirthankara or the Saviour Mahavira. By their clairvoyance they understood that the Lord was born in Kundalapura. So they came there to worship the Arhat. Indra

accompanied by his wife Sasi and followed by a troop of well adorned chariots, elephants, horses, dancers, *Gandharvas*, bulls etc., entered the sacred city. The celestial visitors gave to the Divine Child rich gifts in golden trays and worshipped Him and praised His supernatural qualities. Among those countless people who came to see their Saviour, there were a few grey-haired saints who had many doubts in the Divine Philosophy and had very much differed and disputed among themselves. Their ears long closed to earthly things, caught heavenly sounds and heard at prayer in their distant homes the Devas singing songs at the Jina's birth. They hastened to Kundalapura with the hope that their doubts might be cleared by the sight of the Lord of Wisdom. And when they beheld the child Thirthankara, lo! their doubts were solved as the mist vanishes in the presence of the sun. They became enlightened and praised the Arhat in high terms and called Him Sanmati.

Indra bathed the Divine Child, adorned Him with rich ornaments, and placing Him on a golden throne sang hymns and praised His parents for their *punya* of having the Arhat as their Son.

The king ordered the city to keep high festival; gifts of various kinds were distributed to all people; prisoners were liberated and grand illuminations were held and there was rejoicing everywhere. The whole city seemed a paradise.

Such was the magnificence of the Day when our Lord was born; and it is the duty of every Jaina to remember that memorable day and commemorate it every year. This year our Lord's Birth Day, the *Janma Thriyodasi* comes on the 1st of April. All Jainas we hope will arrange festivals on that day in honour of our Lord. Public meetings may be held in Temples or in public halls to read the Life of Mahavira. Jainas of various sects and conflicting opinions should forget their petty differences and shake hands with cordiality and brotherly love to celebrate the Birth Day of their Common Teacher.

May Peace and Joy reign everywhere and at all times!

God.

ALL the great religions which believe in a Supreme Being hold different opinions concerning the nature of that Being. There are six different conceptions of God which are most prevalent and common. They are,

i. God is the immediate, substantial cause of the universe.

ii. God is the remote cause of the universe.

iii. The universe is the manifestation of God's will.

iv. God is the only sentient being in the universe.

v. The whole universe is God. The differences of form, figure etc., of the substances in the universe are due to Maya or Illusion.

vi. There is no God in the sense of the creator, protector and destroyer of the universe but an Order of Divinity.

Let us now examine the above theories one by one and find out how far each theory is consistent with the laws of philosophy and reason.

1. The first theory says that God is the immediate, material or substantial cause of the universe. This theory of Absolutism gained prominence during the time of Shankaracharya who was a strong cosmotheistic preacher. His followers, after him, advocated this theory most enthusiastically. The main theme of Shankara's religious discourse is that there is nothing but God all-in-all. According to this theory the entity of all substances except God is denied.

This theory of God being the immediate cause of the universe is often explained by the following illustration. As earth is the substantial cause of an earthen pot, the substance God is the material cause of the universe. That is, as the substance earth is changed into the form of a pot so the substance God is modified in the form of the universe. Now, it is a well-known fact that the essential qualities of a substance do not change even though the substance may undergo a number of changes. Even after the earth becomes a pot, the essential characteristics of the substance earth are found in the pot.

Again when the earthen pot is broken to pieces and pounded, its qualities remain as before unchanged. In the same way if God is the material cause of the universe the essential qualities of God must also be found in the universe. What qualities do the followers of this theory assign to God? They say that God is an omnipotent, omniscient, all-pervading sentient entity enjoying unlimited felicity and bliss. But we do not find any such quality

common in all the substances of the universe. On the other hand we see substances of conflicting characters and properties; for instance, soul is a sentient substance; matter is non-sentient; soul and *akasa* have no form or figure while matter has form or figure. (Here by form and figure is meant the form and figure perceived by our material senses.) We understand and distinguish things only by their attributes. When we find things possessing the same properties and qualities, we see that they are essentially one substance; and when a substance is modified into different things, we find the qualities of the original substance present in the newly made things. So how can we account for the differences in the characteristics of the substances of the universe, when the entire universe is nothing but God's own entity? This theory cannot stand the test of reason and hence is rejected.

2. What does the second theory say? According to this theory God is the remote cause of the universe. As potter is the remote cause of the earthen pot, God is the indifferent and unconcerned creator, protector and destroyer of the universe. The holders of this theory affirm the eternal existence of God, Soul, and matter. As the substances of the universe are eternal and indestructible we cannot mean *original* creation by creation, ultimate annihilation by destruction, or preservation of substances by protection. So let us first understand what they can mean by the triple functions. By creation they mean the organisation of the substances into a particular form or figure or evolution or development of the universe into the past, present and future conditions in which this universe existed, exists or will exist; by protection they mean the preservation of a particular modified form and by destruction they mean the cessation of the operation of qualities, properties and functions in the substances on the day of the expiration of the term of the existence of the universe. They say that God is the indifferent creator, protector and destroyer of the universe. The whole process is a queer freak of God who can very well be said to be devoid of reasoning or wisdom. Who can do or undo an act without any aim or object in view?

But why should they say that God is indifferent? The reason is apparent. If God is said to be really concerned and interested in creation, protection and destruction of the universe the question arises why was God first displeased with the pre-evolution stage of the universe and pleased with creation and then again dis-

pleased with creation and protection and pleased with destruction. The characteristics of distress and displeasure on the part of God contradict His other qualities which are said to be omnipotence, omniscience, omnipresence, all-light and all-joy. And so they explain this indifference in God's creation, protection and destruction as an innate and connate function of God. What a quaint philosophy it is! Can contrary and contradictory qualities be inherent in one and the same substance? It is quite inconsistent and incongruous with the laws of reasoning that a substance possesses both contradictory and contrary qualities as innate ones.

They say that God is all-pervading i.e., there is no place where there is not God. If so He cannot move Himself, nor move any part of His body nor cause other things to move from one place to another, since there is no place where God is not present. How can God make substances move without moving Himself?

Again God is purely spiritual essence having no material form or figure. How can He cause material substances to combine to-gether and take definite form and figure?

When we say that God is all-happy we mean that He wants nothing (i.e.) He is desireless. But if we accept the view that God desired to create the universe we have to admit that God is not perfect; for desire means want and want implies imperfection. It is an universally admitted fact that all substances except soul are non-sentient. God entertained a will to create the universe and the original substances took definite shapes and the universe came to be. How can non-sentient substances understand the will of God and act according to His directions.

Those who are ignorant of the fact that the whole universe is nothing but the manifestations of the operation of the qualities and properties of the substances on each other regard that the phenomena are caused by God.

(*To be continued.*)

"Heart of Jainism"
(A Review)

BY

J. L. Jaini.

(*Continued from page* 64.)

P. 118. "The Jaina" "may occasionally make use of white lies."—The phrase 'White lies' is known only to the author and

her language. It is quite unknown to Jainism. Did her Pandit ever tell her of sukla asatya? All lies in the eye of Jainism are black.

The Story of King Vasu is distorted like most other matters in the book. There is no deviation from the strict truth as the story is told by Mrs. Stevenson. She has omitted only two words and thus given the story a grotesque turn and a "white lying" character. The controversy was as to the meaning of *aja* as a fit object "for sacrifice", for an offering at a worship. According to Jainism obviously, a goat may not, but grain may be offered. And therefore the dubious answer of Vasu was sinful and a black lie. I wonder why the author omitted the words "for sacrifice" from her narration!

P. 119. I doubt if treason was included in "Adatta dana," which simply means not taking what is not given. When the English ask a friend; May I use your pen for a moment?,—they are practising this virtue, at least in its letter.

In line 5th from the bottom of the page, Parigraha is translated "Covetousness." She confounds it with Greed, *Lobha*. Perhaps a better translation is Possessions, or Attachment to worldly possessions.

P. 121. *Maya*=Deceit.

A cheat "in this life may be born a woman in the next."—He may be born a low man or woman, or a sub-human (tiryancha). All souls ordinarily have all the 4 passions of anger, pride, deceit and greed. But according to Jaina books, the hellish beings have most anger, the humans most pride, the sub-humans most deceit, and the celestials most greed for the enjoyment of mundane life! Thus a cheat would seem most likely to be born a sub-human; but some women are also notoriously deceitful, as women know much better than a mere male, who seldom understands their fine and marvellously mysterious psychology.

The foot-note is rather ambiguous. In its 8th line, after "his son", "*Mârichi*", should be mentioned. The name is not "Marichi".

P. 122-123. Rules of conduct for laymen are mixed up with fundamental principles of philosophy. The result is absurd obscurity and inextricable confusion.

Anantanubandhi Kasaya is the Passion (Kasaya) by which wrong belief (mithyatva or ananta) is induced into or bound (bandha) with the soul. It may be translated as "Error-feeding" Passion.

Apratyakhyana Varniya Kasaya is passion which prevents us from adopting even partial vows. It may be translated as "Partial-vow-preventing" Passion.

Similarly the author has hopelessly failed to give a correct idea of the Pratyakhyana and Sanjvalana Kasaya.

P. 124. Greed. "This sin is said to change the colour of the human heart."—This language has no sense for a student of elementary Jainism. Colour is only lesya; and that is caused by all passions affecting our physical, mental or vocal vibrations. Jainism nowhere teaches a change in the colour of the heart! The quotation from Isaiah i. 18 is instructive. Indeed a truly sympathetic study of all religions with an honest and open-minded endeavour to know the Truth and nothing but It is glorious. But to hold that we have found the whole Truth in one *ism* and then to study another religion is worse than useless. It is ignorant insolence combined with irreligious irreverence.

P. 126. *Râga* "unlocks the very heart of Jainism and reveals the loneliness within."—This depends upon the eye which sees. The eye which wants to see Emptiness may see nothing but lo*n*eliness. The eye which wants to see Truth may see lo*v*eliness.

Foot-note 1.—Why "pathetically"? The Jainas truthfully believe their sins must have their full effect. They reject the convenient doctrine of sinning, and buying forgiveness, by money or prayer, from the old or the new church. If the prayer is true and is wrung from a repentent, humble, reforming soul, the sin is already recognised, analysed, and as much atoned for by the sinner as possible. Christ, or the God prayed to, is only the Ideal in the light of which the penitent has analysed and atoned his transgression. But the sin cannot be suppressed, even as the fact of the sin having been committed cannot be re-called. What is done is the past and irrevocable. The effect, the fruition of the sin, is in the future and it may be modified by our own reform or betterment. But it cannot be forgiven by any one against whom the sin is not committed. If it is said all sins are committed against Christ and a devout repentence to him may gain forgive-

ness, I shall say, this is only an allegorical way of stating the truth, putting Christ in the place of the eternal and immutable Law of Karma of the Jainas and Hindus and all rational or true creeds. By working the Law of Karma in a proper way, the effect of sin may be modified.

P. 127. Mahavira's disciple, Gautama was fettered so long as he called Mahavira: "My Master." Jesus's disciple, Thomas was freed only when he could say: "My Lord and My God."—The author calls this a contrast. It is a contrast, if you see only the expression of Christianity and Jainism. Otherwise it is a parallel. Christ himself addressed his audience: "Ye are the light of the world." After him John said: "I am the light of the world." Krisna claimed in Bhagvadgita: I am God. Come to me. Mahamed claimed to be the Beloved of God. All these point to one thing. All these propounders of Truth identified themselves with Truth. And indeed they were the living embodiments of the Truth realised by them as they severally understood it to be. So Christ emphasised the Ideal as he realised it; and Mahavisa emphasised it as it was absolute and realisable by everyone. Even in Jainism the devout pray to become like Mahavira. In spirituality you possess an ideal only when you become that yourself, and strictly "My Lord" is used only when the speaker knows the Lord fully, i.e,, has become like Him.

Bhakti.—A true Jaina can hold this doctrine of personal devotion only in the sense of being devoted say to Mahavira, as embodying the Ideal which the true Jaina seeks to realise in himself.

P. 128. "The state of godhood is...passions."—The author has entirely missed the Jaina conception of Moksa. The bliss there is perfectly active in self-absorption (Sva-samaya of Kundakundacharya.)

"Loneliness" terrifies the author. She is obsessed with it. But Truth is one, and how can it have company. Even Christ had to drink the cup alone and to bear his own cross! Why this dread of loneliness then? It is one of the Greatest Reflections (Bhavana) of Jainism and Mrs. Stevenson herself deals with it at p. 158, but with her usual legend, less than half-revealing the force and truth of the Jaina teaching.

The book contains 298 pages, excluding the Index. I have done only 128 pages above. Naturally for lack of my own full knowledge of Jainism and from the nature of things, I could not but take up the more glaring mistakes which struck me. And yet this Review has become much longer than I intended it to be. By even a critical review, I knew my function was not to find faults; but perhaps I am led to record more blemishes than achievements of the industrious and gifted author. This was inevitable from the character of the book and the spirit in which it is written.

The book is an encyclopaedic mixture of many incongruous matters. It contains women's superstitions, monk's practices, layman's sins and sorrows, Jaina teachings on Metaphysics, Ethics and Ritual, with a large slice of secular and sacred History thrown in. The whole is embellished with legends and stories and speculations gathered indiscriminately from illiterate, superstitions women, blithe schoolboys, worldly monks who hide forbidden money on their bodies, Jainas who assure the author of her becoming a Siddha! From a sober and scholarly point of view the whole is reminiscent of chaos or of the witches' cauldron in Macbeth.

Add to the above the colouring of the author's express prejudice in favour of Christianity and against Jainism or any other creed but Christianity. The wonder then is that she could give so many facts, although grossly misrepresented and distorted. The book, so far as Jainism is concerned, is a curious mixture of "half-truth half-lies." It is hopeless to find its scheme. It is as crooked as the knot in the root of the bamboo.

It is impossible for me to review the whole of it in detail here. Therefore I simply give a few points in the rest of the book, taking up the last Chapter in the end. But I must say that **there is hardly any doctrine or dogma of Jainism which had not been given in a mutilated, misrepresented, inaccurate, misleading or incomplete form in this book.** Grace of style, or felicity of diction are absurd compensations for the mangling of principles of religion and doctrines of philosophy, with the help of which people want to see the Truth and lead true lives. My omissions to point out errors should not be construed as meaning that so far as I can look from the Jaina point of view, the omitted portions are free from great mistakes.

P. 132. Sin can impede knowledge.—It is not quite right. The distinction between Papa (Sin) and the Karmas is not given here. The Avadhi and Manahparyaya kinds of knowledge are not properly understood.

P. 133. Bhoga and Upabhoga are confounded: Bhoga is enjoyment of things which are consumed by use and can be enjoyed only once, like a grape or glass of water. Upabhoga is of things which can be enjoyed again and again, as a skirt, book &c.

"Rejoicing" in one's strength.—This is wrong. Viryantaraya Karma simply obstructs the use of our powers.

Darsanavarniya—"Evil effect on sight" is absolutely wrong. It is a Karma which obscures conation of 4 kinds.

P. 134. Narakanupurvi is wrong.—It is the power of retaining the last form whatever it was, in going to the hellish condition of existence.

P. 135. Kasaya = Passion, and not 'sin'.

No-Kasaya = Minor passions and not 'faults'.

Hasya, Laughter is a minor passion. It is unnecessarily misunderstood and ridiculed. *It deludes.* In serious pursuit of truth, one cannot be always laughing. Add when one *is* laughing or joking, the equanimity of the soul is obviously disturbed.

Rati is absolutely wrongly described. "A Sadhu must not rejoice in beauty &c. &c." And yet if he meditates upon an Arhat, he must meditate upon the most perfect and lovely human form and figure!

P. 143. "Only by dying can a Jaina help acquiring Karma." How can one review a gross misrepresentation like this? Death does not prevent the acquisition of Karma, except it be death from mortel life to everlasting life in Liberation! The karmic bondage and body both persist till final Liberation ends them. St. John x. 10 does not come in here at all.

P. 169. J. Stevenson's *Nava Tatva* is not with me. It is dated 1848. The quotations from it show it to be even more unreliable than the present book for a true account of Jainism. e.g., The space of Siddha "increases according to anyone's desire," when we all know that there is neither passion nor desire in the Siddha!

Again, Siddha "without *Caste*" seem to be the limit!

P. 171. It is a gross libel to say: Siddhas are never 'worshipped. They are. Every Jaina bows to them every day. But of course they are represented by different images, similar in their form as those of Arhats. There is a difference in detail but there is worship. It is no place to give the details here.

P. 172. The Hindu ideal of absorption in the su preme is not "alien" but quite familiar to the Jainas in their ideal of self-absorption of pure real standpoint although the detailed character of the two is different.

P. 173. "The unproved doctrine of Karma."—It is simply the Law of Cause and Effect. It seems to be taken for granted, or proved even in the West.

P. 175. 6-7. "As Karma...does inflict hurt or benefit, it must have a form!"—It has form, because it is matter. The whole paragraph is typical of the author's spirit and method.

P. 197. Ganesa worship is no part of Jainism.

P. 245. The Three Jewels are not given in their proper order.

P. 247. The Mahomedan Triad is:

Khaira, Mehr and not *khera* and *Mera*.

(*To be continued.*)

Story of Bandhudatta.*

AT that time there lived in Nagapuri a merchant, named Dhanapati, who had an excellent son, named Bandhudatta. He married Candralekha, the daughter ot Vasunanda. At the moment when the bride's bracelet was tied around her arm, she was bitten by a serpent, and died. In the same way six wives died as fast as he married them. He was, therefore, regarded as a 'poison-hand' (visahasta), and could not obtain any other maiden. His father, seeing him despondent, sent him on an expedition to Ceylon, where he acquired great wealth. On his return he was shipwrecked, but, catching hold of a plank, reached a treasure island. He managed gradually to climb the mountain of jewels, where he saw a jeweled caitya containing an image of the Arhat Nemi. Certain Sadhus who lived there, hearing his story,

* From 'Life and Stories of Parsvanatha' (pp. 170-176) by Maurice Bloomfield.

converted him to the religion of the Jina. A Vidyadhara, Citrangada by name, himself a devout Jaina, was pleased with his piety, took him home, entertained him, and offered him the choice of two gifts: either the Science of flying thru the air, or a maiden in marriage. Bandhudatta remained silent, which the Vidyadhara interpreted to signify the maid. A niece of his, Mrgankalekha, told the Vidyadhara that she had a friend, Priyadarcana, in Kaucambi, about whom a Sage had predicted that she would beget a son, and then take the vow.

Then Bandhu was sent in charge of some Vidyadharas to Kaucambi, where there was a temple of Parcva. He lauded Parcva with an elaborate hymn. While thus engaged, Jinadatta, the father of his prospective bride, came there to praise the Jina, was pleased with Bandhu's piety, took him home, and married him to Priyadarcana. He lived there four years, at the end of which he started home with his wife in a pregnant condition. After passing thru a wild forest, his caravan, camping by a lake, was attacked by Bhillas, belonging to a village chieftain, Candasena. They brought the loot with Priyadarcana to Candasena. He saw her dejected, and learned from her that she was the daughter of Jinadatta. Astonished at this revelation, he bowed before her, and told her that she was his sister, because she was the daughter of his benefactor, Jinadatta. The latter had once saved him from being executed as a thief. Then he asked her what he might do for her: she told him to find Bandhudatta, from whom she had been separated in the melee of the attack. He went in search, but did not find him, whereupon he took oath that he would enter the fire, in case her husband was not restored to her within six months. Candasena then sent out all his Bhillas, but even so they did not find Bandhu. In great worry, Candasena concluded that Bandhu, in despair, had made away with himself. He decided to take Priyadarcana back to Kaucambi, after she had brought forth her child; after that he would enter the fire. While in this state of mind, a handmaiden announced that Priyadarcana had born a son. Thereupon he vowed to his house divinity, Candasena by name, that he would offer up ten men to her, in case Priyadarcana and her son should remain in good health for a month. After 25 days had passed peacefully he sent out his men to capture ten men fit for sacrifice.

In the meantime Bandhudatta had wandered despairingly in the Hintala forest. Unable longer to endure separation from Priyadarcana, he was about to hang himself upon a saptachada tree, when he saw a separated hansa-bird couple reunited, gathered hope from the sight, and decided to return to his own city. But worrying, because it seemed improper to return without his wife, he decided to go to an uncle of his, Dhanadatta by name, in Vicala, to borrow from him the money wherewith to ransom Priyadarcana from her captor, the Cabara chief. As he traveled, he came, tired, to the house of a Yaksa, and there met another wayfarer. He found out that he was from Vicala, so he inquired after the welfare of his uncle Dhanadatta. The traveler related that Dhanadatta's son and his wife had offended the king, and were confined in prison; that Dhanadatta had undertaken to ransom them; and, for that purpose, had set out for Nagapuri, to get the money from him, namely Bandhudatta. In despair at this prank of fortune, Bandhudatta remained there, awaiting Dhanadatta, who was sure to come that way to Nagapuri. After five days Dhanadatta with some friends came along and halted at the same shrine. Bandhu made sure it was his uncle, but did not reveal his own identity.

In the morning Bandhu went to bathe in a river, near which he discovered in a mine-pit a copper chest full of treasure. Then he made himself and his adventures known to Dhanadatta, and offered him the chest wherewith to ransom his family. Dhanadatta refused, bidding him first to ransom his wife, Priyadarcana. In the mean time soldiers of the king arrived, and held up every one who had passed there on the suspicion of robbery. Dhanadatta and Bandhudatta, frightened, threw the chest down by the temple of the Yaksa, were discovered in the act, and cross-examined about themselves and treasure. They alleged that they were merchants from Vicala, on their way to Lata, and that the treasure was inherited. The king's minister, who was with the soldiers, himself opened the chest, and discovered the king's name upon jewels contained therein. He suspected that the chest was only part of the loot taken from the king; had them beaten; but could extract no more information. They were thrown into a hell-like pit, but nothing further came to light.

Now at the end of six months a certain rogue in the garb of an ascetic, having been caught with money on his person, was

brought before the minister. Because a mendicant should not have so much money, he was condemned to death as a thief, and taken outside by the soldiers. He then confessed that he had formerly stolen the king's treasure, of which the chest was a part, all was duly found except that chest. Thief then tells his story. He is the son of a Brahman in the city of Pundravardhana; his name is Cridhara. Once he saw some men apprehended as thieves, and cried out that those criminals ought to be executed. A Muni reprimanded him for his ignorance, telling him that those offenders were merely harvesting the fruits of a previous existence: 'You also will certainly gather the fruit of your previous faults.' When asked to explain, the Muni narrated:

In the city of Garjana, you lived as a pious Brahman, named Candradeva. There also lived a celebrated ascetic, Yogatman. Now a certain widow, Viramati by name, went off with a gardener, named Sinhala; as fate would have it, Yogatman disappeared on the same day. When all the people of the town gossiped that Viramati had gone somewhere, you stated that she had certainly eloped with Yogatman; the people, therefore, became scurrilous about that ascetic. Having committed this detestable (nikacitam) deed, you died, and were reborn successively as goat, jackal, and whoreson, being now in your fourth birth. The Brahman (Yogatman) died of mouth disease in all his existences and was reborn into his same state. Therefore you still have a remnant of your karma to work off.

The thief continued his history: Frightened by the Muni's exposition, he had resorted to asceticism under the instruction of a Guru. Out of regard for him the teacher had bestowed upon him the Sciences (vidya) of going in the air, and of opening locks, with the proviso that these would prove ineffective, unless he preserved purity of life and avoided lies. But, in case he did lie from carelessness, he was to stand in water up to his navel, and, with his arms held upward, recite the vidyas 1008 times. The teacher then went to heaven, but the thief, dissolute person that he was, did everything otherwise. Next day some women in the forest inquired why he was an ascetic. He told them, because his wife had died; moreover he did not perform the expiation for this lie. Next, he performed theft by night, and was seized by guards, whereupon the Science of going in the air failed to operate. Therefore, the thief concluded, 'do what is customary.'

The minister asked the thief why one jewel casket was missing, and he answered that some traveler had found it by chance (daivatas). The minister then mercifully discharged him, and called the two confined suspects. After they had repeated their story, they were released. But, as they went their way, they fell into the hands of the Bhillas, whom Candasena had ordered to capture victims for his goddess Canda. They were joined to others who had been caught for the same purpose, being kept in the temple of the goddess. The chieftain Canda arrived with Priyadarcana and her boy. Considering that she would not be able to endure the sight of the horrible rite, he covered up her eyes with a garment. It happened that Bandhudatta was first to be brought on for the sacrifice. As he pronounced the paramesthinamaskara, his wife recognized his voice, and uncovered her eyes. The chieftain released him, and asked his pardon. Bandhudatta begged off the other victims, the goddess thereafter being content with praise, flowers, and the like. He then introduced his wife to Dhanadatta who blessed her and praised her husband. Their boy was named Bandhavananda in allusion to Bandhu's name and the fact that he was a joy to his relatives. Dhanadatta with the money he needed (to ransom his family) returned home. Bandhudatta, escorted by the Bhilla chief, returned to Nagapuri, was honored by the king, and the story of his adventures converted many to the religion of the Jina.

Creation.

BY

Herbert Warren.

(London.)

The definition given in Chambers's English Dictionary as follows :—

"Creation : the act of creating, especially the universe."

"Create : to bring into being out of nothing."

So creation is the act of bringing the universe into being out of nothing. It is a philosophical subject, but very soon merges into religion. Whether the universe was or was not created must be a matter of belief, not of knowledge ; because no human being could have witnessed the creation ; in order to have done so he would have had to have been already in existence. The subject therefore becomes a matter of religious belief.

Creation is put forward to explain the fact of man's existence; not only man's existence but the existence of the whole universe. The theory is that existing things must have been created. Is this theory a true one? Why should we believe that anything which exists must have been created? A true theory will not be inconsistent, it will apply to every instance; but it is a remarkable fact that those who hold the creation theory always give an instance which disproves it, they mention something not created.

There can be creation, but not in the sense which is usually meant when speaking of the creation of the universe. Creation is possible in the sense of something coming into existence which did not exist before, but only by something else going out of existence. We can evaporate water and get steam; or we can condense steam and get water. But this is not creating something out of nothing; creation in the dictionary sense of bringing into being out of nothing must be denied.

The difference between the undisputed and obvious fact that from one thing another can be made, and the ordinary meaning when creation of the universe is spoken of is that in the one case something else besides the maker existed before the creation of the new thing, while in the other case nothing else existed. In order that something new may come into existence there must be got only a maker, but also the raw material out of which the thing is to be made, already in existence before the creation of the new thing. Creation, then, can be affirmed as possible when it is meant that given a maker and a raw material, some new thing can come into existence.

Just as the universe cannot be explained by postulating a maker only and no raw material, so too is it impossible to explain the universe by postulating a raw material only and no maker; metal does not of its own accord become watches, nor does a homogeneous nebula become a differentiated universe. By "raw material" here we mean a homogeneous substance. The view that at one time different things did not exist but that only some one homogeneous substance existed out of which all the different things about us were made, is perhaps as difficult to get rid of as is the idea that God created the universe.

There seem to be the two theories (and there may be also more theories) about the universe, that it was created out of nothing, or that it is the result of evolution from a homogeneous nebula or other substance, and neither of these two theories is satisfactory, because the theory of creation denies the existence of a raw material, while the theory of evolution denies the existence of any outside influence or maker. A maker only, a raw material only, neither is sufficient, there must be both. And it is a curious fact that while science denies the existence of the maker, theology denies the existence of the raw material. The true view acknowledges the existence of both, "*nimitta*" and "*upadana*" circumstance and substance, watchmaker and metal, fire and water (to create steam), cold air and steam (to get water), the soil and the acorn to get the oak. And it is interesting and important here to note that "raw material" is not absolutely raw, but is only so in relation to the new thing which it is going to be. Metal is raw material in relation to the watch into which it is going to be made but if we are going to make a piece of metal by melting down a watch, then the watch is "raw material." So raw material is always a finished article, it is never stuff in general, it is always some particular thing. The oak is the finished article in relation to the acorn; but the oak is raw material in relation to the wooden tables and chairs which it is going to be made into.

But there is another and more serious defect in both these theories, and that is that they both fail to accomplish the task undertaken,—at least this is true of the creation theory. It fails to solve the problem of existence. What is wanted is an explanation of the universe, and by "universe" is meant everything that exists. All that these two theories do is simply to add one more item to the list of existing things, theology adds God to the list, and science adds its nebula, in both cases there is something already in existence to begin with, God in the one case and Nebula in the other; but existence is the very thing that has to be explained.

It seems to be a conviction of the human mind that anything which exists can be accounted for, and it sets to work to account for it. Thus we get different accounts of the universe, that it is the work of a Creator, or that it has evolved from a Nebula. There may be other ways of accounting for the universe, but in

each of these two cases what is effected is the establishment of a relation, in the one case the universe is now known or thought of in relation to a Nebula. This establishment of a relation between the thing to be explained and the thing which explains it gives a sort of satisfaction to the mind; the mind has two things to think of instead of only one, its universe is thought of in relation to something else,—God, or Nebula. We will not stop here to discuss the difficulty that as "universe" means everything there cannot be something else! At present we wish to consider this enquiring nature of the mind and the satisfaction obtained in the way just mentioned. And as this essay is on Creation we will now drop the subject of evolution. The mind feels convinced that anything which exists can be accounted for, and when it has been accounted for there is a satisfaction for the time being; how to account for the universe? it was created by God: thus the enquiry is settled, and we go on with our ordinary business until the mind again becomes active along the same line and, taking up the subject where it had been left, asks how is this new subject to be accounted for? We have accounted for the universe, it was created by God; now how are we to account for God? A very natural enquiry, but what about the answer? There is none, we are up against a brick wall, we have reached final ground and can go no further. How to account for God's existence is a problem which many hesitate even to raise, much less to insist upon having it cleared up satisfactorily. But it is a sort of door, and if we will have the courage to open and go through it we shall practically enter upon a new life. And there need be no fear; it is perfectly safe to make the venture provided we are really serious about it. When this question is replied to at all and not ignored, it is not admitted that God's exist nce needs to be accounted for. The theory that anything which exists must have been created is now dropped; God was not created but always existed. This is the answer we generally get. It is quite contrary to the other view that creation is necessary to explain existence; here we have something which was not created. This idea is worth while considering, the possibility of there being something which was not created. It is altogether a new view, but is very widely held, and it shows that the human mind is capable of believing in existence without having it explained by creation. We must, therefore, not shelve it without examination, but must look into it. It is believed

to be true in one instance, is there any other instance of something of which we can believe that it was not created? Yes space. We cannot very well think of space as being the same as God, we must regard space as something different from God. We must think of God as existing in space, so if God is, was, and always will be, then the space in which He exists must always have been there for Him to exist in, which is to say that space is, was, and always will be; in other words that there never was a time when space did not exist, and if it always existed it did not need to be created. Space, then, is another instance of something existing which was not created. We need not discuss the view that space is merely a mode of the mind's functioning: let us regard space as that which contains other things and does not itself need to be contained, is not a kind of thing that needs to be contained.

Time is perhaps another instance of something which must be thought of as not having been created. It is obvious that time must always have existed. If God existed before the creation, then time also must have existed before the creation. We need not go into the matter of what "time" is; one view is that time is the duration of the states of substances, five minutes, thousand years. It is not merely a way of knowing; there would still be time if there were nobody to know it.

Now with regard to matter. It is perhaps more difficult to prove that matter was never created, but one way will be thus: take any material thing, we know that before being what it now is it was something else, the loaf of bread was a lump of dough; before being that thing, it was previously something else. The dough was flour and water. And so we can go on backwards as far as we like without ever being able to come to a time when the substance (or substances, of course, in the case of compound things) did not exist. And the same is true going forward; any material thing we like to think of which exists to-day, will become some other material thing (or things) in the future, and so on to infinity. That is to say, any material thing which is now in existence has, so far as its substance is concerned, always been and always will be in existence in some form or other somewhere in the universe. This view is supported by the teaching of modern science that matter is indestructible. Also it is simply another way of saying what has already been said, that in order for some

new thing to come into existence some other thing (or things) must go out of existence, there must be the raw material pre-existing any new thing. Perhaps this is sufficiently obvious without illustration or further elucidation, and it proves the permanent existence of matter. Thus we have space, time, and matter existing without having been brought into being out of nothing. And, further, there seems to be no proof that matter was created. Experience teaches us that there are no material things existing now the substance of which did not exist previously; all that takes place when a new thing comes into existence is change of form, or a change of relation.

We found that the human mind is capable of believing in existence without creation; is it possible to believe in the existence ef the soul without believing it to have been created? It is the soul, or living principle in man, animals, and plants which we now have to consider as to its being created or not. The body of man, animals and plants comes under the heading of matter: those who do not regard life as the operation of soul but who believe life to be a quality of matter, will not require to know whether or not it was created separately from matter, but those who believe life to be a quality of the soul and not of matter will require to know whether or not it was created. We know that living beings are not created now-a-days; they grow; the acorn in a suitable soil and climate will accumulate to itself more and more matter from outside until it reaches the full stature of the oak tree. The change in this case is due to forces working from within, and drawing upon the surroundings tor supplies. Matter never does this; a brick will not grow into a house, nor will a heap of bricks get to work of their own accord and become a house. So, postulating a soul as the animating power in trees, animals, men, birds, fish, insects, and any other form of life we now have to consider whether or not this soul was created. As well as growth there are sentience and consciousness in all living beings; growth only applies to embodied living beings. Soul, then, must be regarded as something real and different from matter. The trend of this article is to deny that anything is ever created in the sense of being brought info being out of nothing, and therefore to deny that the soul was created. But some elucidation is necessary in view of the fact that living beings are born and die. God is perhaps generally regarded as a living being,

and it is generally denied that God was created. If it is possible for one living being to exist without having been created, why is it not possible for each and every soul? Those who believe in a soul, generally believe it to be immortal. If it is immortal forwards why should it not be so backwards? If it has an infinite future why not an infinite past? no beginning and no end to its existence. Beginnings and endings apply only to states; existence as a chrysalis, for instance, has its beginning and ending; before it began to be a chrysalis it was a caterpillar, and when its life as a chrysalis comes to an end it is followed by being a butterfly. We have not sufficient knowledge to tell what it is after that, but we may be sure it is something. The butterfly probably does not remember his chrysalis or caterpillar states, but his lack of memory does not prove his previous non-existence, nor does man's lack of memory prove previous non-existence. It is true that in the illustration just given no corpse is left behind, nor are there any parents of the chrysalis or butterfly. The caterpillar takes his body with him to his new state, and though he does not enter a womb he still goes into a suitable place where the forces in him can do their work. And although in becoming a butterfly the caterpillar or chrysalis takes with him all the physical matter of which his body is composed, it is quite conceivable that when the butterfly dies he takes with him not all but only some; and that this matter which he does carry with him into the new womb is of a subtle kind too fine for the eye to see, so that the departing and arriving soul not being seen might easily be supposed not to be there at all; and the same with human or any other beings.

So we have three reasons for holding the belief that the soul is not created, namely, that what is true of one living being should be true of all; that the soul is always regarded as immortal forwards, and therefore to be consistent it must be so backwards, and thirdly, there is no proof that the soul is or ever was created.

To return to the subject of final ground, we now see that whereas the creation theory of theology finds only one thing in existence which was not created and which serves as the final ground of explanation of the known universe, there are at least three or four things which may be regarded as not having been created and which are so to speak final grounds. With these in existence we can explain the known universe of things which are

always changing, always coming into and going out of existence, for we have a differentiated universe always in existence and thus there are always both the raw material and its external circumstances, either animate or inanimate to account for the changes which take place either in a mechanical way by the action of matter or under the guidance of the will and intelligence of the soul. In this way we avoid the difficulty of having a universe coming into existence merely by the action of a maker without any raw material, or the other difficulty of a homogeneous substance becoming a differentiated universe without any external instrumentation. Space and time must each be thought of as one thing, but of matter and souls there is an infinity of atoms and individuals respectively, each atom and each soul being an ultimate unit and not a compound. And in their varied separations and combinations these atoms and souls bring new things continually into existence. Thus we get perpetual change in a permanent universe, a universe which from one point of view is, was, and always will be finished, and in another sense is not, never was, nor ever will be finished. Beginning with the universe as it is at the present day we can trace it continually backwards to what it was in the past as far as we like to go, or can go forward and trace its infinite future,—this in imagination until we are omniscient.

With a universe which in one sense is always finished and in another sense is never finished, there arises the question of perfection, or of the Millennium, or the Kingdom of God, or any other ideal; and thus we come upon the religious aspect of our subject.

If the universe was not created, then in view of the fact that our morals and spiritual life are based on the theory that it was, what about conduct, how are we to behave? and what hope is there? If we grant the possibility of becoming an ideal human being and eventually a pure soul, then the ways and means of doing so become the basis of our conduct. In Christianity Christ's life is looked upon as an ideal life; there is in the universe an infinity of souls, and the universe has been going on for all time, so it is reasonable to believe that some souls have become ideal living beings, such as Mahavira and others are recorded to have become. Such souls serve us as examples, and as spiritual teachers; they are as it were elder brothers, and the records they have [illegible]ow they became what they were serve as our moral code.

This is not an essay on ethics and not the place for an ethical code, nor for a description of an ideal life, but whatever would be considered to be an ideal life it is obvious that we ourselves have never yet attained it, for whatever other characteristic it might have it could not be considered ideal if it were only temporally so and not everlasting. But the fact that our present life is not ideal is no reason why it never should become so. If we have always been living in ways which prevent our life from being ideal, it is no reason why we should continue to do so. Our condition and character are in accordance with our deeds; as we sow we reap; and non-injury to living beings is the highest religion; so the way to become an ideal human being and eventually a pure soul is among other things to practice non-injury based on a feeling of universal love, according to the teachings just mentioned. Knowledge is one of the chief natures of the soul, and an ideal life would include unlimited knowledge. Knowledge is not merely perception, knowledge is a knowledge of the means, the means of doing good, of making money, or satisfying desires, or of the means of becoming perfect, or any other end. Obviously any Garden of Eden condition would not be ideal; an ideal condition must be one from which we could not be turned out and from which we could not fall. It is the nature of the fully developed soul to lead an ideal life. Thus we see what *hope* there is for us. Every embodied soul is in fact a potential God, not in the sense of creator or ruler of the universe, but in the sense of being liberated soul.

To sum up, we have considered two theories of the universe and have found them both faulty. We have echoed a more reasonable view, have found at least four ultimates, and have considered ideals and right life.

Notes and News.

Mr. Dharanchand Jain, the Honorary Secretary of Shri Jain Swetambar Sthanakvasi Granthalaya, Indore, sends us the following news about *Jain holidays*:—

We thank H. H. the Maharaja Holkar, Indore, for his kindness in granting the following holidays in 1920 to the Jainas. The Jain holidays are Mahavira Jayanti (1st April). Mahavira Janmotsava Shravan (13th Sept.), Samwatsari Parva (16th Sept.), Paryushan Parva (17th Sept.), Ananta Chatudasi (26th Sept.), Diwali-Mahavira Nirvana (8th and 12th Nov.), Sidhachal Yatra (26th Nov.). We hope that the Jain subjects in the other Native States and in British India, will request their ruling authorities to grant them holidays on important religious festival days.